R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 586 JC 660 186

REMEDIAL ENGLISH INSTRUCTION IN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES--AN ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF CURRENT PRACTICES.

BY- BOSSONE, RICHARD M.
CALIFORNIA STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, SACRAMENTO

PUB DATE SEP 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.64 66P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *CURRICULUM EVALUATION, *ENGLISH CURRICULUM, ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, *REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION, REMEDIAL COURSES, SCRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

QUESTIONNAIRES WERE DISTRIBUTED TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN, TEACHERS OF REMEDIAL ENGLISH, AND STUDENTS IN 12 JUNIOR COLLEGES. IN ADDITION, PERSONAL INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED WITH THE REMEDIAL ENGLISH INSTRUCTORS. SPECIFIC LANGUAGE ART SKILLS WERE RANKED IN ORDER OF WEAKNESS. THE DATA REFLECT THAT REMEDIAL ENGLISH CLASSES ARE NOT VERY EFFECTIVE AND SHOULD BE REAPPRAISED BY ALL CONCERNED. SEVERAL CONTRIBUTING FACTORS ARE (1) QUESTIONABLE PLACEMENT PROCEDURES, (2) LACK OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THOSE INVOLVED IN TESTING, COUNSELING, AND TEACHING, (3) INADEQUATELY TRAINED TEACHERS, (4) OUTDATED COURSE OUTLINES, (5) VAGUE OBJECTIVES, (6) LACK OF KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS' DIFFICULTIES, AND (7) OVERSIZED CLASSES. THE IMPORTANCE OF IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROGRAM IS EVIDENCED BY THE FACT THAT 70 PERCENT OF ENTERING FRESHMEN FAIL THE QUALIFYING EXAM FOR ENGLISH 1A. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT REMEDIAL CLASSES BE LIMITED TO 20 STUDENTS AND THAT NO TEACHER BE REQUIRED TO TEACH MORE THAN TWO REMEDIAL CLASSES OR BE ASSIGNED SUCH CLASSES IN HIS 1ST YEAR. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING PLACEMENT TESTS, SYLLABUSES, OBJECTIVES, AREAS OF EMPHASIS, METHODS, GRADING, AND NEW APPROACHES ARE MADE WITH SUGGESTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH. (DE)

ED012586

ERIC

REMEDIAL ENGLISH INSTRUCTION

IN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF CURRENT PRACTICES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 10 1966

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION · BUREAU OF JUNIOR COLLEGE GENERAL EDUCATION
MAX RAFFERTY, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

JC 660-186

REMEDIAL ENGLISH INSTRUCTION IN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES:

AN ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF CURRENT PRACTICES

By

Richard M. Bossone, Ph.D.
Director of Secondary and Junior College Education
University of California, Riverside

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Paul F. Lawrence
Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction
and Chief, Division of Higher Education

Arthur M. Jensen, Chief
Bureau of Junior College General Education

September, 1966

FOREWORD

California is justly proud of its "open door" policy. This philosophy allows many of our youth, particularly those who are not high school graduates, their last chance for a second chance.

This "open door" commitment, as strongly as it is supported, brings with it many problems, not the least of which are those that relate to subject offerings. The wide divergence among entering students in terms of previous educational experiences requires particular concern and attention as to the types and kinds of subject matter which should be offered.

One of the least publicized responsibilities of our junior colleges is to be found in the area of remedial instruction. The Master Plan for Higher Education in California clearly sets forth the fact that one of the functions of the junior college is to provide remedial courses for those students whose preparation for their chosen curriculum is inadequate.

The need to give serious attention to the importance of at least one aspect of remedial instruction is borne out by the research of Dr. Richard M. Bossone, the author of this study. He states, "Approximately 70 percent of the entering freshmen (of which there are approximately 270,000) in California public junior colleges fail the qualifying examination for English 1A." This is a most startling statement. Steps must be undertaken to decrease this percentage of failure.

In this initial study, Dr. Bossone points up our need to give serious attention to the improvement of remedial instruction in our junior colleges. Much more research needs to be undertaken; this study involved only 12 of our 76 junior colleges. The Department is planning to do a follow-up study involving all of our California public junior colleges. We need more experimentation, much more, in remedial English. Instructors in this area are urged to devote more time and attention to the problems of remedial instruction. Each administrator and instructor genuinely concerned with his responsibility in the area of remedial instruction will find much in the following pages to challenge his thinking. We hope you will join with others to improve instruction in this most important area of our responsibility.

PAUL F. LAWRENCE
Associate Superintendent of
Public Instruction and Chief,
Division of Higher Education

ARTHUR M. JENSEN
Chief, Bureau of Junior College
General Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study has entailed the interest, time, and efforts of the following people to whom special thanks are due:

Dr. Paul F. Lawrence, Dr. Emil O. Toews, Dr. John N. Given, and Dr. Carl G. Winter, California State Department of Education, who gave encouragement and assistance in getting the project under way.

Dr. Thomas B. Merson, Research Director, California Junior College Association; Dr. Henry C. Meckel, San Jose State College; Dr. William O. Binkley, University of the Pacific; Mr. James L. Billwiller, City College of San Francisco; Mr. John W. Blair, Chaffey College; Mr. Robert W. Danielson, Grossmont College; Mr. William A. Grant, Cabrillo College; Mr. David D. White, College of San Mateo; Miss Miriam E. Young, American River College; Mr. Frank Ratliff, Gunn High School, Palo Alto; Mr. Richard Levine, Educational Testing Service, Berkeley, California, who offered advice and critical comments regarding the questionnaires.

Mr. Rutledge Jay, Dr. Morris J. Garber, and the staff of the Computer Center, University of California, Riverside, who gave invaluable aid in tabulating the data.

All the department chairmen, teachers, other staff members, and students of the junior colleges who participated in this study and who provided the challenge.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
INDEX TO TABLES	ix
PART I. INTRODUCTION	1
Objectives	2
Procedure	3
PART II. THE CHAIRMAN AND THE REMEDIAL ENGLISH PROGRAM	4
Placement Examinations	4
Growth and Size of Classes	5
Number of Classes Assigned to a Teacher	6
Dropouts and Failures	6
Failures Who Complete the Course and Repeat It	7
Objectives of the Course as Stated in the Course Outlines	8
Use of Experimental Approaches	8
PART III. THE TEACHER AND HIS REMEDIAL ENGLISH CLASSES	10
Average Size of Classes	10
Experience, Training, and Preferences for Teaching the Course	11
Training for Teaching the Course	12
Preferences for Teaching the Course	13
Opinions Regarding Placement of Students	13
Opinions Regarding Syllabi	14
Course Content	
Objectives	14
Areas of the English Curriculum Emphasized	14
Methods and Materials Employed	16
How Methods Differ from English 1A	16
Materials Employed	17
Attitudes Toward Materials Employed	17
Methods and Materials Found to Be Most Effective	18
Methods and Materials Found to Be Least Effective	18
Opinions Regarding Students' Problems in English	18
Opinions Regarding Students' Interests in English	
Reading	19
Writing	19
Assignments	20
Opinions Regarding Students' Characteristics	20
Grading Standards	20
Distribution of Grades	21
Opinions Regarding Effectiveness of Course	21

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
PART IV. THE STUDENT AND HIS READING AND WRITING INTERESTS AND PROBLEMS	22
Age Range	22
Sex, Marital Status, Citizenship, and Schooling	23
Social Background and Goals	23
Ratings of High School English Training	23
Opinions Regarding Areas of Difficulty in English	24
Opinions Regarding What They Need to Learn	24
Opinions Regarding Their Reading Interests	25
Reading and Literature Done in the Home	
Newspapers	26
Magazines	26
Books	27
Opinions Regarding Their Reading Problems	27
Opinions Regarding the Study of Grammar and Their Problems in This Area	28
Methods and Materials	28
Opinions Regarding the Study of Composition and Their Problems in This Area	29
PART V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	31
Summary	31
Recommendations	33
APPENDIX	39
Junior Colleges and Chairmen of English Departments Participating in the Study	41
Remedial English: Titles and Course Numbers	43
Questionnaire for Chairman of the English Department	45
Questionnaire for Teachers of Remedial English	49
Questionnaire for Students Enrolled in Remedial English	55

INDEX TO TABLES

		Page
1.	Dropouts from Remedial English Classes	6
2.	Failures Who Completed the Course	7
3.	Failures Who Complete the Course and Repeat It	7
4.	Times a Student May Repeat the Course	8
5.	Average Size of Classes in Remedial English	10
6.	Teachers' Preferences Regarding Average Size of Classes in Remedial English	10
7.	Teachers' Years of Experience in Teaching English in a Junior College	11
8.	Teachers' Years of Experience in Teaching Remedial English in a Junior College	12
9.	Areas of the English Curriculum Teachers Emphasize	15
10.	Methods Employed in Teaching Remedial English	16
11.	Materials Employed in Teaching Remedial English	17
12.	Distribution of Grades in Remedial English Classes	21
13.	Age Range of Remedial English Students	22
14.	Students' Ratings of High School English Training	24
15.	Students' Opinions Regarding What They Need to Learn . . .	25
16.	Students' Preferences in Reading	26
17.	Students' Ratings of Methods and Materials Used in the Teaching of Grammar	29
18.	Kinds of Writing Students Expect to Do After College . . .	30

REMEDIAL ENGLISH INSTRUCTION IN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES
AN ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF CURRENT PRACTICES

PART I

INTRODUCTION

Approximately 70 percent of the entering freshmen (of which there are approximately 270,000) in California public junior colleges fail the qualifying examination for English 1A (or equivalent transfer course); and, with the trend toward education for all persons through the age of twenty, there will be undoubtedly an increase in the number of students in need of remedial English work. A recently issued report of the joint committee of the National Council of Teachers of English and the Conference on College Composition and Communication on "English in the Two-Year College" substantiates this, for it states, "this kind of course is not only widespread at present but it is on the increase."[1]

Further, it is obvious, as the four-year institutions and universities raise standards and tend to assume less and less responsibility for remedial English, the junior colleges, especially in California, with their open-door policy are forced to assume more and more responsibility. As Kitzhaber points out in Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College, the majority of students who formerly populated remedial English courses in the four-year institutions now appear to be going to junior colleges.[2]

Unfortunately the junior colleges do not know exactly what to do about this growing number of remedial English students. With very little encouragement to investigate this problem, the junior colleges have tended to carry on in a trial and error fashion hoping to find some answer. But in remedial English, where academic selection takes place in the process of coursework and, as a result, determines so much of the student's future, can one afford to leave so much to chance? I think not. However, until something is done to determine proper guidelines for teaching remedial English, much will be left to chance, and the students will continue to have only a limited opportunity for success. That this is often the case today is evidenced by the fact that many students who enroll in remedial English fail to complete the course satisfactorily and are, thereby, doomed to failure or forced to terminate their education. (In one California public junior college, which is fairly typical, of the 80 percent who enroll in remedial English only 20 percent go on to English 1A.)

---

[1]Samuel Weingarten, et al, English in the Two-Year College, Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965, p. 51.

[2]Albert R. Kitzhaber, Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963, p. 94.

Unless something is done--specifically research on the abilities, interests, and problems of remedial English students so that this information can be related to the development of a more appropriate course or program to meet their needs--we will continue to have the same vicious circle of frustration and wasted efforts. Common sense should tell us that the mere existence of remedial English courses does not mean they have been effectively designed, and I doubt seriously if they ever will be until we learn more about the students for whom they are to be designed and we improve the quality of instruction. To quote Dr. Weingarten, chairman of the joint committee on "English in the Two-Year College" mentioned above:

> From the data in the Report emerges the inescapable fact that the two-year college must realistically solve the problem of what type of instruction in English should be given students who are poorly prepared or who for other reasons do not have language aptitudes that qualify them for a regular first year college English course. We cannot wish out of existence the necessity for remedial courses. The Report shows the wide extent to which the general situation has necessitated the introduction of such courses. It also shows a great need for the development of more suitable teaching materials for such instruction than exists now.[3]

In order to determine the type of instruction that should be given to remedial English students and in order to help teachers understand why they must adjust their teaching accordingly, this study was undertaken.

Objectives

The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To discover on what basis junior college students are being classified as remedial English students and what the institution's general policy is regarding remedial English

2. To discover what junior college remedial English teachers are doing in their classes, what their attitudes are regarding the subject, and what they know about their students' abilities, interests, and problems

3. To discover what junior college remedial English students' attitudes are toward English and what they consider to be their interests and problems in English

---

[3]Samuel Weingarten, "The NCTE-CCCC Status Survey of English Instruction in the Two-Year College: What It Means and Where It Points," Research and the Development of English Programs in the Junior College, Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965, pp. 29-30.

4. To make recommendations for improving the effectiveness of junior college remedial English classes

Note:

Though many California public junior colleges have more than one level of remedial English, this study was concerned only with the remedial English class which the student must take if he fails the English placement examination and which he must pass to be admitted to English 1A (or equivalent transfer course).

Procedure

To obtain data needed to accomplish the first three objectives, the investigator chose twelve out of the present seventy-five California public junior colleges which were representative of various factors (rural-urban, geographical location, age, socio-economic) to insure an adequate sample and cross-section of personnel and students.

The investigator visited these junior colleges during the fall semester, 1965, to talk with personnel and students connected with the remedial English program, to obtain course outlines and samples of the students' writings, and to administer three questionnaires: the first to the chairmen of English departments, the second to at least four teachers of remedial English on each campus, and the third to at least 100 day students then enrolled in remedial English classes on each campus. If a class had fewer than 25 students because of absences or withdrawals, the investigator visited additional classes on that campus to insure involving the necessary number of people. The total number of people involved was as follows: 12 chairmen of English departments, 56 teachers of remedial English, and 1,239 students.

It should be noted that figures presented in this study are based on the replies of the above number of people to the questionnaires submitted to them. Where totals differ from these figures, it is because some of the questionnaires were answered erroneously or incompletely in regard to the item under discussion.

PART II

THE CHAIRMAN AND THE REMEDIAL ENGLISH PROGRAM

Placement Examinations

The 12 chairmen who replied to the question, "What placement examination in English is used in your college?" reported that the following tests were being used:

Tests	Number of Junior Colleges
Cooperative English Test and Scholastic College Achievement Test (verbal section)	4
Scholastic College Achievement Test (verbal section)	2
American College Testing Program (English Usage)	2
Cooperative English Test and California Language and Reading	1
Cooperative English Test (English Expression)	1
Iowa Tests of Educational Development Test No. 3, Correctness and Effectiveness of Expression	1
The New Purdue Placement Test in English	1

Cut-off scores used by these junior colleges reveal a wide range and variety of practices; in some instances approximately 80 percent of the students are relegated to some form of remedial English; in others approximately 55 percent are relegated to some form of remedial English--the approximate average percentage of students relegated to some form of remedial English is about 70 percent and, of these, approximately 35 percent are relegated to the remedial English that may lead to English 1A; the remainder are relegated to some form of sub-remedial English.

At only two junior colleges in the sample is an essay written at the same time the student takes the placement exam. At two other junior colleges, the essay is written during the first week of school to check on placement. Eight chairmen indicated they do not require an essay. In the two institutions where an essay is written at the same time the student takes the placement exam, the chairman of the department graded all the essays and, at the other, two full-time English instructors graded all the essays--a herculean effort to say the least.

Most of the English chairmen and junior college English teachers to whom the investigator spoke felt the essay test, which demands original thinking and writing, was the best measure for placement; but in light of the growing number of students, heavy teaching loads, limited amount of time and money, they felt it was a lost cause.

Those who were involved in testing and counseling of students tended to favor objective tests which they felt were as reliable, if not more so, than the written essay. When asked "Why?" they said that English teachers could not agree on the criteria for grading the essays and that objective tests were more expedient. However, while many of these people tended to favor objective tests, they were not entirely satisfied with present placement procedures and were still engaged in the endless work of evaluation.

It should also be noted that, on the whole, there seemed to be a certain lack of communication and, in some cases, animosity between these people involved in testing and counseling of students and members of the English department, which certainly did not help the situation.

Four department chairmen indicated other criteria were used in placement: one indicated <u>some</u> consideration was given to high school grades in English and the results of an interview with his staff; one indicated <u>considerable</u> consideration was given to high school grades in English and an interview with a counselor; one indicated <u>some</u> consideration was given to high school grades in English and <u>considerable</u> consideration was given to the interview with a counselor; one said <u>considerable</u> consideration was given to the interview with a counselor; one said other tests were considered; one said high school grades in English, an interview with staff, and an interview with a counselor were all considered when there was doubt; six indicated no other criteria than the placement examination were used in student placement.

Nine chairmen reported that no <u>specific</u> information regarding the student's performance on the placement test was given to teachers of remedial English and three indicated specific information was given; however, later in the questionnaire, when asked how information was disseminated, the latter corrected their answers by saying the information was not disseminated but it was available. All of the teachers with whom the investigator spoke said they received no specific information regarding the student's performance on the placement test and many were uninformed about the <u>complete</u> procedure regarding student placement.

<u>Growth and Size of Classes</u>

Although only four chairmen had exact information readily available regarding the increase in the number of remedial English sections over the past five years, all indicated some increase; the increase ranged from about 2 percent to 90 percent--the average being about 30 percent.

Nine of the chairmen reported the average class size at the beginning of the semester to be about 31-35 students, and three reported it to be about 25-30. Six of the chairmen said the remedial English classes had about 5-10 more students in them than the English 1A or 1B classes, and six said they did not differ in size; in proportion to other English classes and total enrollment, three reported there has been an increase in the size of remedial classes, six said there has been no increase, three did not know.

Number of Classes Assigned to a Teacher

Nine of the chairmen reported that the average number of classes in remedial English given to an instructor to teach in one semester was two classes; three reported it was three classes.

Dropouts and Failures

One section of the questionnaire for chairmen dealt with the percentage of students who, in a typical remedial English class, drop out before completion, generally for academic reasons, and the percentage of students who complete the course but receive a failing grade. Tables 1 and 2 show the differences that exist between various institutions.

TABLE 1*

DROPOUTS FROM REMEDIAL ENGLISH CLASSES

Number of Chairmen	Percentage of Dropouts
2	33%
3	25%
2	20%
1	15%
4	10%

*See note under Table 2 on page 7.

TABLE 2*

FAILURES WHO COMPLETED THE COURSE

Number of Chairmen	Percentage of Failures
1	33%
3	25%
1	20%
3	10%
2	5%
1	0%
1	Did not know

*Note: These percentages do not include the number of students who passed the course with a D or C but still were not eligible to go into English 1A. In one junior college the student must obtain a B in order to be eligible for English 1A, in another a C+, and the remainder require at least a C. The average percentage of remedial English students who do not go into English 1A for one reason or another is approximately 70 percent.

Failures Who Complete the Course and Repeat It

Another section of the questionnaire for chairmen dealt with the percentage of students who complete the course with a low grade and repeat it, and the number of times the student may repeat the course. Tables 3 and 4 show the differences that exist between various institutions.

TABLE 3

FAILURES WHO COMPLETE THE COURSE AND REPEAT IT

Number of Chairmen	Percentage of Students
3	50%
2	33%
4	20%
2	10%
1	Did not know

TABLE 4

TIMES A STUDENT MAY REPEAT THE COURSE

Number of Chairmen	Number of Times
3	1
4	2
5	Indefinite number

Nine of the chairmen reported that the student receives credit toward the Associate in Arts degree if he passes the course, and three said he receives no credit.

Objectives of the Course as Stated in the Course Outlines

Examination of the remedial English course outlines submitted by the respondents reflect a wide variety and uncertainty about aims; for example, these course outlines revealed a range from no specific objectives or vague objectives, such as "The student will work toward success in making a point" to "understanding research techniques in the writing of documented papers." In many instances the course outlines were outdated (some were five or six years old) and obviously did not reflect the thinking of the entire department. However, one can say that generally the principal aims of this course, as stated in the course outlines, are as follows:

1. To review rules of grammar, punctuation, and mechanics
2. To read critically models of written expression
3. To write effective paragraphs and essays

Use of Experimental Approaches

In response to the question, "Have any experimental approaches in teaching remedial English been tried by your instructors in the past five years?" ten chairmen said "yes" but offered no extensive information, and two said "no." Those who responded in the affirmative mentioned such things as programed instruction, use of spelling tapes, special spelling classes, reading improvement textbooks, writing labs, and the combining of classes into large groups for presentation of English fundamentals.

Only two said that these experimental approaches would be retained (those dealing with spelling improvement), four said it was questionable that they would be retained, and four said they would not be retained.

In response to the question, "Are there any arrangements in your program to insure individual student assistance?" seven of the chairmen said "yes," but all they generally meant when queried further was that an instructor was required to keep office hours; three said "no."

PART III

THE TEACHER AND HIS REMEDIAL ENGLISH CLASSES

Average Size of Classes

One section of the questionnaire for the teachers is concerned with the average size of remedial English classes in California. The teachers' reports on this subject are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5

AVERAGE SIZE OF CLASSES IN REMEDIAL ENGLISH

Class Size	Number of Teachers	Percent
15-20	0	0
21-25	9	16.0
26-30	19	33.9
31-35	24	42.8
36-40	4	7.1
Over 40	0	0

One can infer from the above data that the average size of remedial English classes is approximately 32 students; however, from Table 6, below, it is obvious that most teachers prefer that the average size of remedial English classes be approximately 22 students.

TABLE 6

TEACHERS' PREFERENCES REGARDING AVERAGE SIZE OF CLASSES IN REMEDIAL ENGLISH

Class Size	Number of Teachers	Percent
15-20	23	41.0
21-25	29	51.8
26-30	4	7.1
31-35	0	0
36-40	0	0
Over 40	0	0
Number of respondents who teach the course regularly		48
Number of respondents who teach the course periodically		8

Experience, Training, and Preferences for Teaching the Course

The range of years of teachers' experience in teaching English in a junior college and teaching remedial English in a junior college varies from 1-29 years; however, in both instances it appears that the majority of teachers are beginning or non-tenure teachers (Tables 7 and 8).

TABLE 7

TEACHERS' YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN TEACHING ENGLISH IN A JUNIOR COLLEGE

Years	Number of Teachers	Percent
1	15	26.7
2	12	21.4
3	4	7.1
4	10	17.8
5	3	5.3
6	2	3.5
7	1	1.7
8	1	1.7
9	1	1.7
10	3	5.3
11	1	1.7
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.
20	2	3.5
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.
29	1	1.7

TABLE 8

TEACHERS' YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN
TEACHING REMEDIAL ENGLISH IN A JUNIOR COLLEGE

Years	Number of Teachers	Percent
1	17	30.3
2	14	25.0
3	1	1.7
4	9	16.1
5	4	7.1
6	2	3.5
7	1	1.7
8	2	3.5
9	1	1.7
10	1	1.7
11	1	1.7
12	1	1.7
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.
20	1	1.7
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.
29	1	1.7

Training for Teaching the Course

In response to the question, "Do you feel you received the proper training in English to teach this course?" nine teachers (16.1 percent) answered "yes," nineteen (33.9 percent) answered "somewhat," and twenty-eight (50 percent) answered "no."

A few of those who indicated "yes" mentioned they had a good course in teaching remedial reading or writing or a good course in methods of teaching English. Others did not say what special training they had had or said they did not believe special training was necessary.

Those who indicated "somewhat" or "no" were asked what they felt was lacking in their training. In order of frequency, the following items were mentioned:

1. A course in modern grammar

2. A course in advanced composition

3. Courses in language and linguistics

4. Courses in the teaching of remedial reading and writing

5. A course in analysis of language problems

In response to the question, "Do you feel competent now to teach this course effectively?" forty teachers (71.4 percent) said "yes" and sixteen (28.4 percent) said "somewhat"; no one said "no." Many teachers who said "yes" had only just begun to teach the course (see Table 8) and had indicated they had not received proper training. When queried about this possible contradiction, many responded they were "learning by experience." At that point one cannot help but wonder at what expense to students.

Preferences for Teaching the Course

In response to the question, "Do you enjoy teaching this course?" thirty-three of the teachers (58.9 percent) said "yes," twenty (35.7 percent) said "somewhat," and three (5.3 percent) said "no." Obviously at least 41 percent of the teachers are not very enthusiastic about teaching remedial English, and obviously they are misplaced teachers who cannot do the best job in a situation where teacher enthusiasm counts for so much.

Opinions Regarding Placement of Students

In response to the question "Do you receive specific information regarding students as shown by the answers on the placement examination?" five teachers (8.9 percent) answered "yes" (they meant that the information was available) and fifty-one (91 percent) said "no."

In response to the question "Do you feel the placement procedure for students is satisfactory?" twenty-nine teachers (51.8 percent) said "yes," seventeen (30.3 percent) said "no," and ten (17.8 percent) did not know.

The majority of those who answered "yes" qualified their response by saying that, when the college placement procedure is supplemented by the English department's requirement that an essay be written, they felt the placement procedure for students was satisfactory.

The majority of the respondents who said "no" recommended generally the following things, in this order of frequency, to improve the placement procedure:

1. Require an essay to be written at the time of placement (Although these respondents admitted the drawbacks of time, money, lack of criteria for grading, etc., they still felt this was the best way to measure a student's ability.)

2. More discussion within the department and with other junior college English teachers about this problem

3. More time and money to do some research on this problem

It should be noted that only one teacher mentioned that the placement procedure might be meaningful to him if he received specific information about the student's performance. Perhaps teachers have been operating for so long on intuition without such information they feel it is not important to receive specific information about the student's performance--a most curious situation indeed in an educational era dominated by the philosophy that a teacher must know his students.

Opinions Regarding Syllabi

In response to the question, "If your department has a syllabus for this course, do you feel it has been helpful?" thirteen teachers (23.2 percent) answered "yes," and twenty-seven (48.2 percent) said "no." Those who answered "yes" were asked to specify in what way it was helpful; half the respondents said it provided a partial guideline for organizing their teaching and the other half did not say. Those who answered "no" were asked to please state "why not"; practically all of the respondents said it was too general, too obvious, or too idealistic to be of any practical value.

Course Content

Objectives

In response to the question, "What are the basic objectives of this course?" the same vague and general objectives as appeared on the course outlines (see page 8) were usually indicated. Most frequently mentioned was simply that the major objective of this course was to bring the student up to the level of the English 1A student--which is far from being specific, unfortunately.

Areas of the English Curriculum Emphasized

Teachers were asked to indicate what areas of the English curriculum they emphasized and to what degree. Teachers tend to favor a method in grammar that combines the traditional approach with the structural approach (only a few seemed knowledgeable about generative grammar); they appear to place greater emphasis upon mechanics, writing expository paragraphs and essays, and reading essays for analysis and meaning and as models for writing (Table 9).

TABLE 9

AREAS OF THE ENGLISH CURRICULUM TEACHERS EMPHASIZE

Areas of English Curriculum	Number and Percentage of Teachers Emphasize					
	Much		Some		None	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grammar					2	3.5
a. Traditional	5	8.9	11	19.6		
b. Structural	1	1.7	2	3.5		
c. Generative or transformational						
d. Combinations of:						
a and b	13	23.2	12	21.4		
a and c	1	1.7	1	1.7		
b and c	2	3.5	2	3.5		
a, b, and c			4	7.1		
Mechanics	32	57.1	20	35.6		
Spelling	9	16.1	33	58.9	7	12.5
Vocabulary	12	21.4	30	53.5	6	10.7
Writing						
a. Paragraph	38	67.8	17	30.3	1	1.7
b. Essays or themes	35	62.5	12	21.4		
(1) Exposition	37	66.1	10	17.8		
(2) Description	9	16.1	27	48.2	11	19.6
(3) Narration	5	8.9	21	37.5	21	37.5
(4) Persuasion	13	23.2	26	46.5	8	14.2
Reading essays						
a. For analysis and meaning	8	14.2	3	5.3	2	3.5
b. As models for writing	2	3.5	5	8.9	1	1.7
c. Both	25	44.6	10	17.8		
Reading imaginative literature						
a. Name type	4	7.1	21	37.5	28	50.0
Research paper	2	3.5	7	12.5	44	78.5
		*		*		*

*These columns add to more than 100 percent because the teachers naturally emphasize more than one area of the English curriculum.

Methods and Materials Employed

When teachers were asked to indicate what teaching methods they use primarily, the majority indicated the lecture or discussion methods (Table 10).

TABLE 10

METHODS EMPLOYED IN TEACHING REMEDIAL ENGLISH

Methods*	Number of Teachers	Percent
Lecture	36	64.2
Discussion	52	92.8
Programed instruction	10	17.8
Television	0	0
Team teaching	1	1.7
Audio-visual	7	12.5

*Other methods mentioned (one or two times) were "board demonstrations" and "writing workshop session."

It should be noted that nearly all teachers who use the lecture system generally qualified their use of it, when queried by the investigator, by saying the lecture was in conjunction with discussion; however, what they meant by "discussion" ranged from recitation of drill work to Socratic questioning.

Teachers who employed programed instruction generally had reservations about it for numerous reasons which generally centered around the inadequacy of the program or the student's lack of interest and ability either to transfer or to retain what he learned.

Teachers who were more interested in teaching reading tended to emphasize audio-visual methods.

How Methods Differ from English 1A

In response to the question, "Do the methods of teaching in this class differ in any way from the methods used with regular English 1A students?" thirty-four teachers (60.7 percent) said "yes," eighteen (32 percent) said "no," and four (7.1 percent) did not respond.

Those who said "yes" were asked to explain how their methods in remedial English differed from those employed in English 1A; here again were a wide variety of answers, most of which were not too clear or extensive; but on the whole they can be summarized as follows:

1. Employing more drill work or mechanical exercises

2. Emphasizing the writing of paragraphs more than complete themes

3. Giving less lectures and constantly varying the class presentation so one does not lose their attention

4. Giving fewer assignments and less work than given in English 1A

Those who said "no" were asked if they thought their methods should differ in any way from methods used with regular English 1A students. Of the eighteen teachers who said "no," nine (16.1 percent) said "definitely not," two (3.5 percent) said "yes, but don't know how," and seven (12.5 percent) could not say.

Materials Employed

Teachers were asked to indicate what materials they employed in teaching remedial English. The majority indicated they utilized mainly workbooks and readers (Table 11).

TABLE 11

MATERIALS EMPLOYED IN TEACHING REMEDIAL ENGLISH

Materials*	Number of Teachers	Percent
Workbooks	41	73.2
Readers	34	60.7
Handbooks	15	26.7
Programed texts	7	12.5

*Other materials mentioned (three or four times) were collection of short stories, modern novels, and mimeographed literary materials.

It should be noted that the majority of teachers who used workbooks used them in conjunction with readers and, in some instances, with handbooks.

Attitudes Toward Materials Employed

In response to the question, "Do you find these materials satisfactory?" ten teachers (17.8 percent) answered "yes," thirty-seven (66.1 percent) answered "somewhat," and nine (16.1 percent) answered "no."

Those who indicated dissatisfaction with the materials indicated that they would like to see materials that included the following: more contemporary readings from magazines and newspapers which would reflect the variety of reading levels usually present in the class; materials that insured a better correlation between drills or exercises and the writing process; materials that were less abstract; a good programed text.

Methods and Materials Found to Be Most Effective

In response to the question, "What methods and materials have you found to be most effective in helping remedial students?" no consensus could be established; however, mentioned four or five times were analysis of essays (which were of interest to the student) and individual conferences in class (when time permitted it). Other suggestions ranged from panel discussion on topics chosen by the students to "drill, drill, drill."

Methods and Materials Found to Be Least Effective

In response to the question, "What methods and materials have you found to be the least effective?" nineteen teachers (33.9 percent) said workbooks with long, involved exercises and "language that was outside the student's reality," ten (17.8 percent) said lectures, five (8.9 percent) said handbooks which were too complex or abstract, and two (3.5 percent) said programed texts which were too long and involved.

Opinions Regarding Students' Problems in English

In attempting to discover what major problems teachers believe students have in reading, writing, speaking and listening, a list of possible student problems under each of the language arts skills was prepared and teachers were asked to check those they felt were major problems and to add any additional ones not mentioned. Listed in the order of frequency checked or mentioned, respondents indicated that the students' major problems were as follows:

A. In Reading

1. Inadequate vocabulary
2. Inability to grasp the central idea of long passages
3. Inability to grasp supporting ideas
4. Inability to understand the mood or tone in literature
5. Inability to concentrate

B. In Writing

1. Inability to organize
2. Commitment of gross errors in writing, such as sentence fragments, comma faults, lack of agreement between subject and verb, lack of agreement between noun and pronoun, inconsistency in verb tense, dangling constructions (Frequently to this list teachers added "misspelled words.")
3. Inadequate knowledge of mechanics
4. Insufficient ideas
5. Poor diction
6. Carelessness or lack of interest

It should be noted that all of these problems in writing were confirmed by the investigator's examination of samples of the students' writings at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester.

C. In Speaking

1. Impoverished vocabulary
2. Lack of fluency in oral expression
3. Repetition of phrases and expressions
4. Speaking in elliptical units
5. Poor enunciation
6. Lack of social poise or simply being afraid

D. In Listening

1. Short attention span
2. Inability to select important details from what they hear
3. Inability to grasp gist of lectures
4. Inability to remember what they hear

Opinions Regarding Students' Interests in English

Reading

In response to the question, "Do you feel that most of the students enjoy reading?" ten teachers (17.8 percent) said "yes," forty-four (78.5 percent) said "no," and two (3.5 percent) did not respond. Those who said "yes" were asked what they thought the students enjoyed reading. Most frequently mentioned were "selections with which they can identify" and short stories.

Writing

In response to the question, "Do you feel students enjoy writing?" six teachers (10.7 percent) said "yes," forty-eight (85.7 percent) said "no," and four (7.1 percent) did not respond. Those

who responded "yes" were asked what they thought the students enjoyed writing about; here there was less certainty on the part of the respondents, but generally they indicated it was about "personal experiences."

Assignments

In response to the question, "What kind of work, assignment, or activity in the course seems to interest them most?" here again there was less certainty on the part of the respondents and certainly no consensus. Comments ranged from "nothing" or "it doesn't concern me" to such things as "discussion of contemporary affairs or personal problems." A few mentioned doing "short assignments that do not require much thinking or work."

Opinions Regarding Students' Characteristics

In response to the question, "Is there anything in the make-up of the students in remedial English that seems characteristic (e.g., low IQ, poor socio-economic background, linguistic deficiencies, lack of motivation, poor study skills, etc.)?" forty-four teachers (78.5 percent said "yes," eight (14.2 percent) said "no" (they felt they could not generalize about their students), and four (7.1 percent) did not know.

Of the forty-four teachers (78.5 percent) who said "yes," the following student characteristics were most frequently mentioned in order of frequency:

1. Lack of motivation
2. Poor study skills
3. Poor socio-economic background
4. Linguistic deficiencies

Grading Standards

In response to the question, "Are your grading standards different from grading standards in your regular English classes (1A and 1B)?" twenty-three teachers (41 percent) said "yes," twenty-eight (50 percent) said "no," and five (8.9 percent) did not say.

Those who answered "yes" were asked to explain in what way. Although their responses reflected many different ideas, teachers generally seem to indicate they were compromising their standards a little by grading more on grammar and mechanics and less on how well the student handles an idea. Quite a few of those teachers who used different methods did not employ different grading standards.

When asked to describe briefly the method of evaluation of student achievement at the end of the remedial course, twenty-eight teachers (50 percent) said in one fashion or another they simply asked themselves the question "Will the student survive in 1A?" To answer this question, these teachers considered whether or not the student was able to write fairly well three or four essays (toward the end of the course) which were free of gross errors. Twelve teachers (21.4 percent) said they used a correlation of grades the student made in grammar, mechanics, and spelling tests with his grades on composition. Sixteen teachers (28.4 percent) did not indicate what their method of evaluation was.

Distribution of Grades

Teachers were asked to indicate what percentage of their students in the course receive the following grades: "A," "B," "C," "D," "W" (withdrawal), "F." The majority (approximately 65 percent) indicated the following grading distribution pattern prevailed in their remedial English classes (Table 12).

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF GRADES IN REMEDIAL ENGLISH CLASSES

Grade	Percent
A	0
B	0-5
C	40-50
D	30-40
W	5-10
F	5-10

The above table indicates that the grade distribution is generally skewed toward the lower grades.

Opinions Regarding Effectiveness of Course

In response to the question, "How effective do you think this course is?" five teachers (8.9 percent) said it was effective if the students have the right attitude or if the classes are not too large, forty-eight (85.7 percent) said it was not very effective or moderately effective, two (3.5 percent) did not know, and one (1.7 percent) did not say. Their responses to this question obviously contradict their responses to the question, "Do you feel competent now to teach this course effectively?" to which 71.4 percent of the teachers said "yes" and 28.4 percent said "somewhat."

PART IV

THE STUDENT AND HIS READING AND WRITING INTERESTS AND PROBLEMS

Age Range

The majority of junior college remedial English students appear to be eighteen or nineteen years old. The average age is 19.1 years (Table 13).

TABLE 13

AGE RANGE OF REMEDIAL ENGLISH STUDENTS

Age	Number	Percent
16	1	0.1
17	33	2.7
18	703	56.7
19	261	21.1
20	77	6.2
21	29	2.3
22	33	2.7
23	17	1.4
24	16	1.3
25	17	1.4
26	7	0.6
27	9	0.7
28	1	0.1
29	1	0.1
30	4	0.3
31	1	0.1
32	2	0.2
33	2	0.2
34	2	0.2
35	1	0.1
36	2	0.2
37	5	0.4
38	1	0.1
39	1	0.1
41	1	0.1
42	1	0.1
43	1	0.1
48	1	0.1
51	1	0.1
No answer	8	0.6

Sex, Marital Status, Citizenship, and Schooling

This study was concerned with 780 male students, 453 female students, and 6 students who did not indicate their sex. The total number of students was 1,239. Of these students, 1,073 (86.6 percent) were single, 65 (5.2 percent) were married, 7 (0.6 percent) were divorced, 4 (0.1 percent) were widows, and 93 (7.5 percent) did not respond. The majority of these students, 1,105 (89.2 percent), were U.S. citizens, and 41 (3.3 percent) were foreign students; however, only 50 percent of these foreign students indicated later in the questionnaire that they were classified as foreign students by the registrar; 93 students (7.5 percent) did not respond.

Of these students, 1,210 (97.7 percent) indicated they were high school graduates and 29 (2.3 percent) indicated they were not; 67 (5.4 percent) of these students indicated they spoke Spanish; 22 (1.8 percent), German; and 106 (8.6 percent), other languages.

Social Background and Goals

The majority of these students (68.4 percent) indicated their father's occupation was in the category of unskilled, semi-skilled, or skilled labor; the remainder (31.6 percent) indicated their father's occupation was in the category of professional, managerial, or sales. Those students (approximately 37 percent) who indicated that their mothers worked stated their mothers were doing mainly clerical work.

Of these students, 1,107 (89.3 percent) work while in school at either part-time or full-time (sales, clerical, semi-skilled, or labor) jobs and the majority (approximately 75 percent) did not believe working interfered with their school work, particularly English.

In regard to vocational goals, 375 students (30.3 percent) indicated they were interested in professional occupations; 157 (12.7 percent) in clerical work; 129 (10.5 percent) in technical or skilled work; 206 (16.6 percent) indicated miscellaneous occupations; and 370 (29.9 percent) did not know. The majority of students, 985 (79.5 percent), felt English would be important in their future work; however, 207 (16.7 percent) did not feel English would be important; the remainder did not know whether it would be or not.

Also, it should be noted that the majority of these students, 918 (74.1 percent), stated they plan to transfer to a four-year college or university; 283 (22.8 percent) stated they did not plan to transfer and 9 (0.7 percent) stated they did not know at this time.

Ratings of High School English Training

In response to the question, "Do you consider that your high school training in the areas of grammar, composition, speaking, reading, literature, and spelling was poor, fair, good, or excellent?" these

students seem to feel their training in grammar, composition, and speaking was not as good as their training in reading, literature, and spelling: generally the average rating in the former areas was poor to fair, and generally the average rating in the latter areas was fair to good (Table 14).

TABLE 14

STUDENTS' RATINGS OF HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH TRAINING

Areas of English	Ratings							
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grammar	318	25.7	492	39.7	364	29.4	56	4.5
Composition	338	27.3	467	37.7	362	29.2	59	4.8
Speaking	319	25.7	481	38.8	354	28.6	70	5.6
Reading	176	14.2	406	32.8	502	40.5	141	11.4
Literature	165	13.3	427	34.5	470	37.9	162	13.1
Spelling	289	23.3	370	29.9	411	33.2	15	12.6

Opinions Regarding Areas of Difficulty in English

In response to the question, "With which of the above areas (listed in Table 14) have you had the most difficulty and in which do you feel the most competent?" there appears generally to be a significant correlation between students' ratings of training received in grammar, composition, literature, and reading and those areas with which they have difficulty and competency: in grammar and composition, which they rated poor to fair, they felt less competent; in literature and reading, which they rated fair and good, they felt more competent. There is generally less correlation, however, between their ratings of training received in speaking and spelling and their ratings of areas in English in which they have difficulty and competency: in these areas students felt less competent than their ratings of their training would seem to indicate.

It should be noted that 291 (23.5 percent) of these students felt they had personal problems that contributed to their difficulty in the above areas, but they were reluctant to specify what these problems were.

Opinions Regarding What They Need to Learn

In response to the question, "In general, what do you feel you need to learn most in this course?" the majority of students specified either composition, grammar, or "everything" (Table 15).

TABLE 15

STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING WHAT THEY NEED TO LEARN

Areas of English	Number of Students	Percent
Grammar	293	23.6
Composition	473	38.2
Speaking	38	3.1
Reading	67	5.4
Literature	15	1.2
Spelling	79	6.4
All of the above	201	16.2
No answer	73	5.9

In conjunction with the above, it should also be noted that 1,009 students (81.4 percent) felt they needed remedial work; 192 (15.5 percent) felt they had been misplaced; 38 (3.1 percent) offered no comment.

Opinions Regarding Their Reading Interests

In response to the question, "Do you enjoy reading?" 687 students (55.4 percent) said "yes," 476 (38.4 percent) said "somewhat," and 67 (5.4 percent) said "no." Note the discrepancy between their responses and their teachers' responses on page 19.

Their preferences in reading, in order of frequency mentioned, were (1) short stories, (2) magazine articles, (3) news, (4) newspaper articles, (5) novels. Least preferred, in order of frequency mentioned, are (1) comic books, (2) plays, (3) poetry, (4) essays, (5) books or articles on technical subjects, (6) biographies (Table 16).

TABLE 16

STUDENTS' PREFERENCES IN READING

Type of Reading	Preferred		Less Preferred		Dislike	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Novels	707	57.1	426	34.4	95	7.7
Short stories	991	80.0	215	17.4	19	1.5
Essays	298	24.1	636	51.3	286	23.1
Biographies	528	42.6	507	40.9	190	15.3
Plays	267	21.5	446	36.0	510	41.2
Poetry	284	22.9	426	34.4	515	41.6
News	768	62.0	395	31.9	58	4.7
Newspaper articles	766	61.8	406	32.8	53	4.3
Magazine articles	889	71.8	297	24.0	29	2.3
Books or articles on technical subjects	370	29.9	522	42.1	328	26.5
Comic books	156	12.6	407	32.8	657	53.0

Reading and Literature Done in the Home

Newspapers

The majority of these students, 1,154 (93.1 percent), indicated their families subscribed to a local newspaper, 23 (1.9 percent) indicated they did not and 62 (5 percent) did not respond; of those who indicated their families subscribed to a local newspaper, 743 (60.0 percent) stated they liked to read other newspapers as well as the local newspaper. Favorite sections of the newspaper mentioned, in order of frequency, were: (1) front page (461 or 37.2 percent), (2) sports (292 or 23.6 percent--boys mainly mentioned this), (3) editorial (113 or 9.1 percent); the remainder mentioned other sections, but they did not constitute a significant number or percentage.

Magazines

In response to the question, "What magazines do you read regularly in the home?" 334 students (27.0 percent) specified Life, 95 (7.7 percent) specified Time, 95 (7.7 percent) specified Look, 68 (5.5 percent) specified Readers Digest, 67 (5.4 percent) specified Saturday Evening Post, 51 (4.1 percent) specified Newsweek, 38 (3.1 percent) specified Playboy, and 370 (29.9 percent) various other magazines too numerous to mention here. Of the magazines listed above, 274 students (22.1 percent) felt that Life had the most interesting articles; 189 students (15.3 percent) specified that Life, and 154 students (12.4 percent) specified that Readers Digest, had the most interesting stories.

Specific subjects of interest to them in magazines appear to parallel the subjects of interest in newspapers: newsworthy topics and sports.

Approximately 91 percent of these students stated that they read magazines in their homes.

Books

In response to the question, "Do you have books of your own (outside of school textbooks)?" 1,065 students (86.0 percent) said "yes," 153 (12.3 percent) said "no," and 21 (1.7 percent) did not respond. The types of books owned were mainly novels and collections of short stories.

Of all the students involved, 975 (78.7 percent) stated they had a public library card; 257 (20.7 percent) said they did not have one, and 7 (0.6 percent) did not specify whether or not they had one.

The number of books checked out of the library during one year by these students ranged from none to ninety-nine; the average was eleven.

These same students, however, did not appear to use the college library very often to check out books for their own reading interests or pleasure: 867 students (70 percent) stated they had not checked out books for their own reading interests or pleasure from the college library and 357 (28.8 percent) stated they had; 15 (1.2 percent) did not respond.

Of those students who specified they had checked out books from either public or college libraries for their own reading interests or pleasure, approximately 50 percent could not remember what they were; the other 50 percent specified mainly that they were novels.

Also, approximately 78 percent of the remedial English students stated their parents were interested in reading and 22 percent stated their parents were not interested in reading.

Opinions Regarding Their Reading Problems

When asked to specify what they believed to be their reading problems, these students listed, in order of frequency, difficulty, and persistence, the following:

1. Inadequate reading speed

2. Inadequate vocabulary

3. Inability to grasp the central idea of long passages in books or magazines

4. Inability to concentrate

5. Inadequate knowledge of how to use library facilities

It should be noted that both teachers (see page 18) and students agree on certain problems students have in reading, namely, inadequate vocabulary, inability to grasp the central idea of long passages, and inability to concentrate.

Opinions Regarding the Study of Grammar and Their Problems in This Area

In response to the question, "Do you like the study of grammar?" 487 students (39.3 percent) said "yes," 700 (56.5 percent) said "no," and 52 (4.2 percent) did not respond.

The majority of these students, 742 (59.9 percent), felt they had specific problems in this area with which they needed help; 428 students (34.5 percent) did not feel they had any specific problems in this area and 69 (5.6 percent) did not say. Of those students who felt they had specific problems in this area, the majority felt they lacked the ability to formulate mature or complex sentence structures or employ the right words in the right order.

Students were also asked to specify what problems they had that related to the study of grammar: 651 students (52.5 percent) specified correct usage, 587 students (47.4 percent) specified punctuation, and 85 (39.1 percent) students specified spelling.

Methods and Materials

Students were asked to evaluate methods and materials used in the teaching of grammar. Those methods and materials found to be very helpful by a majority were the writing of themes and having them corrected, board demonstrations by the teacher, and class discussion. Speeches and oral reports were found by a significant number of students not to be helpful (Table 17).

TABLE 17

STUDENTS' RATINGS OF METHODS AND MATERIALS
USED IN THE TEACHING OF GRAMMAR

Methods and Materials	Very Helpful		Somewhat Helpful		Not Helpful	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
The use of exercise or workbooks	571	46.1	523	42.2	102	8.2
Board demonstrations by the teacher	641	51.7	453	36.6	108	8.7
Class discussion	620	50.0	421	34.0	157	12.7
Study of handbooks	268	21.6	653	52.7	255	20.6
Programed instruction	298	24.1	610	49.2	226	18.2
Writing themes and having them corrected	672	54.2	361	29.1	166	13.4
Short quizzes in class	449	36.2	504	40.7	227	18.3
Speeches and oral reports	225	18.2	412	33.3	527	42.5
Conferences with teacher	443	35.8	461	37.2	255	20.6

The majority of students felt the materials used in their classes were about right as far as level of content. They also felt that a reading and writing anthology geared to their interests was the most interesting kind of material a teacher could utilize and a workbook the most boring kind of material a teacher could utilize. Although there appears to be a contradiction between their ratings about workbooks and their statement here, the students clarified this apparent contradiction by their comments that they knew they needed to engage in exercises or practice, but they disliked the sterile, artificial language and examples in the workbooks that do not relate to real-life communication situations; therefore, they rated workbooks the most boring.

Opinions Regarding the Study of Composition and Their Problems in This Area

In response to the question, "Do you like to write?" 688 students (55.5 percent) said "yes," 467 students (37.7 percent) said "no," and 84 (6.8 percent) did not respond. Note the discrepancy between their responses and their teachers' responses on page 19.

Those who said they like to write gave various reasons, but the most common one was, "It helps improve or satisfy the need for self-expression." Those who said they did not like to write also gave various reasons, but the most common ones were a lack of understanding of how to organize and relate their thoughts or just plain fear of revealing their linguistic inadequacies. These two reasons for not liking writing were also given most frequently by all students when asked to state their greatest problems or difficulties in writing.

In response to the question, "What kinds of writing do you expect to do most after leaving college?" the majority specified personal letters and business letters (Table 18).

TABLE 18

KINDS OF WRITING STUDENTS EXPECT TO DO AFTER COLLEGE

Kinds of Writing	Number	Percent
Business letters	638	51.5
Business reports	478	38.6
Speeches	289	23.3
Personal letters	741	59.8
Articles for magazines	59	4.8
Newspaper writing	82	6.6
Technical or scientific writing	252	20.3
Short stories	92	7.3
Novels	30	2.4

These students also stated that they prefer to write both in and outside of class rather than doing one or the other exclusively. There was no consensus as to whether or not help from the teacher while writing or the exchanging of papers with other students was beneficial, but there was a definite consensus that having a regular conference with the teacher about their writing and being given mimeographed samples of "A," "B," and "C" papers would be beneficial.

PART V

SUMMARY

This study of "Remedial English Instruction in California Public Junior Colleges" was made in order to answer certain primary questions that need to be considered if improvement in remedial English instruction is anticipated: (1) On what basis are junior college students being classified as remedial English students and what is the institution's general policy regarding remedial English? (2) What do junior college remedial English teachers do in their classes, how do they feel about it, and what do they know about their students? (3) What is the attitude of junior college remedial students toward English, and what do they consider to be their major problems and interests in English?

Generally the data reflect that remedial English classes in California public junior colleges are not very effective and are in need of reappraisal by all concerned with improving the teaching of English in the two-year college. Undoubtedly there are many contributing factors that make these classes ineffectual, and this study has noted only a limited number of these factors; however, they are important and must be considered if this unpleasant state of affairs is to be rectified. The factors noted in this study are as follows:

1. Questionable placement procedures

2. Lack of communication between those involved in testing or counseling and guidance and those involved in the teaching of remedial English

3. Oversized classes and overworked teachers

4. Inadequately trained teachers and generally unenthusiastic teachers

5. Outdated and superficial course outlines

6. Vague objectives

7. Lack of agreement about what should be emphasized in the course

8. Lack of suitable instructional materials

9. Confusion about methodology

10. Lack of knowledge about students' reading and writing abilities and interests

11. Lack of knowledge about students' personal problems, limitations, and preferences for methods and materials

12. Variety of subjective grading standards

13. High percentage of student failures

14. Insufficient experimentation

No doubt there are other contributing factors but the above should be enough to make one realize it is imperative that we set our dimensions of thought regarding this problem of improving remedial English instruction on a research basis rather than on an intuitive basis.

Every year the problem of what to do about remedial English cries out louder for attention; and yet, in our period of the "Great Society," when education beyond high school is becoming a right, not a privilege, and when today over 80 percent of all students who first encounter higher education do so through a junior college, this problem continues to be met with apathy, withdrawal, or disdain.

Dr. Thomas Merson at the February, 1965, Tempe Conference on "Research and Development of English Programs in the Junior Colleges" made an eloquent plea for action, but as yet nothing has been done except for the usual individual college's yearly assessment of its placement procedure, most of which can be likened to a man trying to drink himself sober.

What we need is an intelligent and comprehensive course of action taken by teachers of the blood, sweat, and tears school who will gladly assume some of the responsibility and <u>most of the initiative</u>: teachers who are aware of the psychological consequence of a student's failure in a success-oriented culture, teachers who know that only those who have to face the hordes from our Educational China every year could possibly be as concerned or as motivated to take action. These teachers will remove the roadblocks to learning by getting the support of their administrators, professional organizations, State Department of Education, foundations, and other agencies to initiate a statewide study commission to work on this crucial problem <u>now</u>. And, as a prelude to this course of action, these teachers may wish to consider the following recommendations, many of which were made by the people who participated in this study.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Placement Tests

Research should be initiated on a statewide basis to collect objective information from junior college remedial English teachers about examination questions that might be used to test entering junior college students. Teachers should indicate only those questions which are relevant to course goals and how well a student would be expected to perform; in this way, data can be obtained that would give an objective summary of the areas of agreement and disagreement, as well as a summary of the levels at which teachers expect students to perform. This would help to make the placement test an integral part of the remedial effort, rather than something apart, which now it is, with its emphasis mainly on usage and vocabulary which teachers do not seem to emphasize in remedial English (see page 15).[4] Further, until a test is properly devised to determine the student's ability to write a coherent essay, teachers should require that an essay be written in class during the first week to corroborate placement. Students should be made to feel that writing is more important than mere recall of isolated facts or information as presently administered objective tests lead them to believe.

A single test is a poor indication for placement of students. Colleges should use all supplementary aids, such as high school English grades, aptitude tests, letters of recommendation (from administrators, teachers, and counselors), interviews with staff, and essay exams, in order to insure more accurate placement procedures.

People in the junior colleges involved in testing, counseling and guidance, and the teaching of remedial English need to meet more frequently to discuss this problem of placement in order to work out more satisfactory methods of communicating and exchanging information and ideas and in order to establish a placement procedure not solely for the expedient needs of the institution but for the needs of the students as well.

2. Size and Number of Classes

Remedial English classes should be held to 20 students each; this is five more students than the number recommended by members of the Conference on College Composition and Communication in 1958. Therefore, a class size of 20 students should not be considered unreasonable. The remedial student needs more individual attention than he can possibly get in a larger class. For those who do not believe that smaller classes are part of the answer, reference should be made to one of the conclusions drawn by the State

---

[4]Acknowledgment should be made here to Richard Levine of Educational Testing Service, who discussed this problem with the investigator at a meeting in Berkeley, California.

Assembly Interim Committee on Education: "The committee concludes that a reasonably small classroom size is directly related to pupil achievement. The committee believes that the available evidence shows that small pupil-teacher ratio and relatively generous teacher salary scales have a directly beneficial relationship to the achievement of pupils in the public schools."[5]

As for number of classes, no teacher should be required to teach more than two remedial English classes in one semester if he is expected to have any stamina left or to be more than a hit-and-run educator. Further, such teachers should teach no more than twelve hours, not to reduce the number of hours he works but to allow him more time to assign and grade compositions and to confer with students, all of which is vital to insuring success.

3. Teachers' Experience, Training, and Preferences

No inexperienced teacher, unless he has received training for remedial work, should be assigned to teach such a remedial English class his first year. It is ironic that inexperienced teachers are considered to be unprepared to serve on major committees but yet are given one of the most difficult teaching assignments.

In regard to training, all remedial English teachers need courses that will make them more knowledgeable about language, modern grammar (which is substantiated by the fact that surprising numbers of teachers did not know what transformational or generative grammar was), composition, and, in particular, teaching remedial reading and writing. Above all else, they need to have training that will give them specific insight into the junior college students' linguistic problems so that English will be taught with continuous attention to the problems confronting the students who are trying to learn.[6] Practicing teachers should urge their administrators to develop in-service training programs along these lines.

No teacher should be assigned to teach a remedial English class who prefers not to do it or who is only somewhat interested. It is sheer folly to expect unenthusiastic teachers to motivate students who are noted for their lack of motivation. Teachers must motivate students toward a desire to learn, and teachers cannot do this if they themselves are not enthusiastic. To insure more thinking about this problem, teachers might do well to read Maslow's Motivation and Personality.[7]

---

[5]Report of Assembly Interim Committee on Education, Sacramento, California: Assembly of the State of California, 1965, p. 9.

[6]For a more comprehensive statement regarding suitable training for junior college English teachers, see Richard M. Bossone, The Training and Work of California Public Junior College Teachers of English, Riverside: Office of the County Superintendent of Schools, 1964, pp. 21-25.

[7]A. H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.

4. Syllabi

Syllabi or course outlines that are of genuine benefit to teachers need to be written (and revised regularly). In order to encourage this, chairmen should engage the thinking of all English teachers interested in or currently teaching remedial English. Teachers should scrutinize and evaluate the contents of a syllabus to insure that it is of definite assistance and that it is not simply a forgotten relic in the file of the department chairman.

5. Objectives

Objectives should be meaningful and stated with clarity and completeness; to insure this, teachers might study some of the current literature on how to prepare objectives and, before formulating any statements about objectives, ask themselves these questions posed by Mager:

(a) Does the statement describe what the learner will be doing when he is demonstrating that he has reached the objective?

(b) Does the statement describe the important conditions under which the learner will be expected to demonstrate his competence?

(c) Does the statement indicate how the learner will be evaluated? Does it describe at least the lower limits of acceptable performance?[8]

6. Areas of the English Curriculum

Only when objectives have been stated specifically will it be possible to determine what areas of the English curriculum to emphasize and to ascertain what must be remedied in remedial English. Granted, individual situations will make for some individual differences, but there certainly is some basis for common purposes and practices. At this point, on an intuitive basis teachers seem to place much emphasis on mechanics, writing expository prose, and reading essays. While this may very well be correct, teachers are not absolutely sure unless they know what the level of a student's performance is on placement tests and, as this study shows, teachers do not receive such specific information nor do they seem to be placing much emphasis on what is generally being tested: vocabulary and usage. Undoubtedly no progress can be made toward remedying the situation until educators develop more suitable objectives and tests and they discover what the student's level of performance is and should be. Teachers must, therefore, strive to obtain this information and then relate what they know more effectively to develop an appropriate remedial English course.

---

[8]Robert Mager, Preparing Objectives for Programed Instruction, San Francisco: Fearon Press, 1962, p. 52. For further information about preparing objectives, see Benjamin S. Bloom (ed.), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbooks I and II, New York: David McKay, 1956, 1964.

In addition, teachers should take into consideration the problems and interests of the junior college students cited in this study and read the pamphlet entitled Facts and Issues, 1965-66: Points of Decision in the Development of the English Curriculum[9] before they make any definite decisions about course content.

7. Methods and Materials

Methods and materials should deal with the subject matter to be taught in more specific and smaller units of work which are in line with realistic achievement for the student. Complex and abstract explanations should be avoided. Teachers should utilize material which will enable the student, visually as well as verbally, to comprehend relationships between points. In short, methods and materials must take into account all of the student's linguistic deficiencies and limitations, as well as his interests.[10]

Teachers must find ways to develop and extend the student's reading ability and interests and to teach grammar and composition more effectively; and, above all, teachers should note what the student has to say about effective ways to teach these subjects. Teachers should publish through their professional organizations reports of promising practices or methods so that they can have some means of sharing ideas instead of sinking amid the waves of hints and incomplete suggestions. Why teachers will not present their ideas in detailed written form at junior college English conferences remains a mystery--perhaps English teachers do not like to write any more than their students do.

The California Junior College Association and the State Department of Education should encourage and assist teachers by establishing centers for the development of methods and materials for use in remedial English courses. Unless this is done, possibly teachers will never lift instruction from the sterile, routine busywork that seems to consume much of class time.

8. Grading

Although research today is far from giving us definitive answers to the problem of grading, the problem is not completely insoluble, and administrators and teachers should conduct further experiments in this area. They must ask the question, "How can we improve our grading system?" not because they expect final answers but because the question must be considered.

---

[9]Alexander Frazier (ed.), Facts and Issues, 1965-66: Points of Decision in the Development of the English Curriculum, Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966.

[10]For a more explicit statement about junior college students' linguistic deficiencies, see Richard M. Bossone, "Understanding Junior College Students," Journal of Higher Education, XXXVI (May, 1965), 279-283.

As a beginning, we might take a more positive point of view by not assuming that only five percent can make a "B" or better. There is obviously too much prejudice involved (see Grading Distribution, Table 12, page 21) when an assumption is made that all that can be done is being done in a situation where a student is generally marked for failure.

9. Experimental Approaches

Farsighted leaders in the area of instruction should be encouraged to develop new ways of coping with the remedial English problem. Aside from the establishment of experimental centers for development of methods and materials, junior colleges should experiment with new approaches that would allow for greater blocks of time in a highly coordinated effort to remedy the student's linguistic problems: separate but coordinated classes in reading and writing totaling six units of work, and, in more severe remedial cases, a separate class (but coordinated with the above classes) in speaking and listening. In some instances, then, the student may be taking as much as one half or two thirds of his academic program in English. But is this too much if tests and other evaluative means indicate he needs this much help? Further, is it any more logical to place a student in other classes, such as history, sociology, or psychology, when he is so severely handicapped linguistically? Perhaps if his linguistic problems are concentrated in a more reasonable time block based upon more knowledge of his interests, abilities, and problems, as well as with more adequate methods and materials, we will not have as many "forced-outs" (more euphemistically called dropouts) who are apt to become tax-eaters instead of taxpayers.

In addition to experimentation with certain variations in scheduling, more experimentation needs to be done to determine the place and value of large and small class instruction, team-teaching, lay assistance, technological aids to teaching, and programed instruction which would be designed to facilitate individualized teaching so that each student's program could be laid out with attention to what he already knows and needs to learn rather than being laid out to accommodate the mythical average student.

In short, English teachers need to devote more time, energy, and attention to the problems of remedial English, and they need to explore with their administrators more effective courses and programs if they are to justify the spending of time and money on a remedial tracking system which at present time is generally proving to be ineffectual and generally serving to be the foreboding "closed door" behind the "open door" of California public junior colleges.

10. Additional Research

Throughout this study the need to know more about the remedial English student, proper placement procedures, and methods and materials has been emphasized; however, they need to be emphasized even further to avoid a mélange of indecisions and courses organized in a haphazard fashion. Additional research in depth, therefore, is needed regarding the above. More

specifically needed is research on a mass basis that would corroborate or refute the findings stated here, as well as expand knowledge of the above so that teachers may refrain from operating on a negative, intuitive basis and begin to operate on a positive, informed basis. It makes more sense to research our way into improving the study of remedial English than to guess or argue our way into it.

Let this study, then, be considered merely an attempt to awaken the need for additional research and to engage people in a dialogue about remedial English. And let us all begin now to help resolve this crucial problem by calling for action from all the local, state, and national agencies that we feel would lend us support in this endeavor.

APPENDIX

JUNIOR COLLEGES AND CHAIRMEN OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS
PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

	Junior Colleges	Chairmen of English Departments
1.	American River College	Miriam E. Young
2.	Bakersfield College	Hulon Willis
3.	City College of San Francisco	Donald F. Snepp
4.	College of San Mateo	David D. White
5.	Compton College	Ruth M. Lewis
6.	Foothill College	Harold J. Seger, representing Donald F. Fraser
7.	Laney College	Shirley M. Nedham and Oliver L. Kellogg (Co-chairmen)
8.	Los Angeles City College	Paul R. Ferguson
9.	Mt. San Antonio College	P. Joseph Canavan
10.	San Bernardino Valley College	Josephine B. Broholm
11.	San Jose City College	J. Richard Christian
12.	Santa Monica City College	Richard H. Dodge, representing Donald G. Doten

REMEDIAL ENGLISH: TITLES AND COURSE NUMBERS

English A	Grammar and Composition -College of San Mateo -Compton College	Three units
English X	Remedial English -American River College	Three units
English 21	English Fundamentals -Los Angeles City College	Three units
English 50	English Fundamentals -Bakersfield College	Three units
English 51	Introduction to English Composition -San Bernardino Valley College	No credit
English 51	English Fundamentals -Santa Monica City College	Three units
English 61	English. Writing Workshop -Laney College	Three units
English 68M	Remedial English -Mt. San Antonio College	Three units
English 92	Fundamentals of Composition -San Jose City College	Three units
English 102	Fundamentals of Composition -Foothill College	Three units
Communication C6	Communication -City College of San Francisco	Three units

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CHAIRMAN OF THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

It is entirely possible that your college has more than one level of remedial English, but we are concerned only with the remedial English class which the student must take if he fails the English placement examination and can expect to be admitted directly to English 1A (or equivalent transfer course).

I. Placement

A. What placement examination in English is used in your college?

Please specify if all of the exam is used or which part of the exam is used and where the cut off score is.

B. Is specific information regarding the student's performance on the placement test given to teachers of remedial English? Yes_____ No_____

If so, what information is given and how is it disseminated?

C. Is the student required to write an essay as a part of the placement examination? Yes_____ No_____

If so, how is the essay used (or what is its purpose)?

How is it graded and by whom?

D. Are other criteria used in student placement? Yes_____ No_____

If so, please specify to what degree.

	Considerable	Some	None
High school grades in English	_____	____	____
Interview with your staff	_____	____	____
Interview with counselor	_____	____	____
Other_____	_____	____	____

E. Please state briefly the over-all procedure used in placement of students.

II. Remedial English

A. Beside each of the five academic years below please indicate the number of remedial English sections and the total enrollment in remedial English classes.

	Number of Sections	Total Enrollment
1960-61	_____	_____
1961-62	_____	_____
1962-63	_____	_____
1963-64	_____	_____
1964-65	_____	_____

B. What is the number of classes which have the following number of students at the present time?

Number of classes	Number of students
_____	15 to 20
_____	21 to 25
_____	26 to 30
_____	31 to 35
_____	36 to 40
_____	over 40 (please specify number)

C. How does this differ from the sizes and number of other English classes?

D. In proportion to other English classes and total enrollment has there been an increase in the size of the remedial classes? Yes_____ No_____

E. What is the average number of classes in remedial English given to an instructor to teach in one semester? _____

F. In a typical remedial English class how many students:
dropout before completion (generally for academic reasons) _____%
complete the course but receive a failing grade _____%

G. What are the penalties, if any, for failing the course?

H. Generally, what percentage of students who complete, but fail, the course repeat it? _____%

I. How many times may the student repeat the course? 1___ 2___ 3___

J. Does the student receive credit toward the Associate in Arts degree if he passes the course? Yes_____ No_____

K. What are the stated objectives of the course? (PLEASE ENCLOSE A COPY OF THE COURSE OUTLINE.)

L. Have any experimental approaches in teaching remedial English been tried by your instructors in the past five years? Yes_____ No_____

If so, please describe briefly and underline those experimental approaches which were found to be an improvement over the usual methods.

Will they be retained? Yes_____ No_____

Are there any arrangements in your program to insure individual student assistance? Yes_____ No_____

M. What do you think can be done to improve the teaching of remedial English? Your comments on the remedial English situation would be appreciated.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS OF REMEDIAL ENGLISH

It is entirely possible that your college has more than one level of remedial English, but we are concerned with the remedial English class which the student must take if he fails the English placement examination and can expect to be admitted directly to English 1A (or equivalent transfer course).

I. General Information

A. Course and title number_____

B. What is the average size of your remedial English class or classes?

_____ 15 to 20
_____ 21 to 25
_____ 26 to 30
_____ 31 to 35
_____ 36 to 40
_____ over 40 (please specify number)

C. What do you consider to be a reasonable class size for this course?_____

D. Do you teach this course regularly_____ or sometimes_____?

E. How long have you been teaching English in a junior college?_____

F. How long have you taught this course?_____

G. Do you feel you received the proper training in English to teach this course? Yes_____ Somewhat_____ No_____

If you have indicated "somewhat" or "no," what do you feel is lacking?

H. Do you feel competent now to teach this course effectively?
Yes_____ Somewhat_____ No_____

I. Do you enjoy teaching this course? Yes_____ Somewhat_____ No_____

J. Do you receive specific information regarding students as shown by the answers on the placement examination? Yes_____ No_____

K. Do you feel the placement procedure for students is satisfactory?
Yes_____ No_____

If not, what do you recommend?

II. Course Content

A. What are the basic objectives of this course?

B. Which of the following areas of the English curriculum do you emphasize and to what degree? Please check appropriate answers.

	Emphasize		
	Much	Some	None
1. Grammar	___	___	___
a. Traditional	___	___	___
b. Structural	___	___	___
c. Generative or transformational	___	___	___
d. Combinations of:			
a and b	___	___	___
a and c	___	___	___
b and c	___	___	___
a, b, and c	___	___	___
2. Mechanics	___	___	___
3. Spelling	___	___	___
4. Vocabulary	___	___	___
5. Writing	___	___	___
a. Paragraph	___	___	___
b. Essays or themes	___	___	___
(1) Exposition	___	___	___
(2) Description	___	___	___
(3) Narration	___	___	___
(4) Persuasion	___	___	___
6. Reading essays	___	___	___
a. For analysis and meaning	___	___	___
b. As models for writing	___	___	___
c. Both	___	___	___
7. Reading imaginative literature	___	___	___
a. Name type	___	___	___
8. Research paper	___	___	___

III. Students' Problems

A. What major problems do you feel the students have in reading?

1. Inability to grasp the central idea ____
2. Inability to grasp supporting ideas ____
3. Inability to understand the mood or tone in literature ____
4. Inadequate vocabulary ____
5. Other _____

B. What major problems do you feel the students have in writing?

1. Insufficient ideas ____
2. Inability to organize ____
3. Commitment of gross errors in writing:

a. Sentence fragments ____
b. Comma faults ____
c. Lack of agreement between subject and verb ____
d. Lack of agreement between noun and pronoun ____
e. Inconsistency in verb tense ____
f. Dangling constructions ____
g. Other _____

4. Inadequate knowledge of mechanics ____
5. Poor diction ____
6. Other _____

C. What major problems do you feel the students have in speaking?

1. Lack of fluency in oral experession ____
2. Impoverished vocabulary ____
3. Repetition of phrases and expressions ____
4. Speaking in elliptical units ____
5. Poor enunciation ____
6. Other _____

D. What major problems do you feel the students have in listening?

1. Short attention span ____
2. Inability to grasp gist of lectures ____
3. Inability to select important details from what they hear ____
4. Other _____

E. Is there anything in the make-up of the students in remedial English that seems characteristic (e.g., low I.Q., poor socio-economic background, linguistic deficiencies, lack of motivation, poor study skills, etc.)? Yes_____ No_____

If so, please explain.

IV. Students' Interests

A. Do you feel that most of these students enjoy reading? Yes_____ No_____

If so, what? _____

B. Do you feel that most of these students enjoy writing? Yes_____ No_____

If so, about what? _____

C. What kind of work, assignment, or activity in the course seems to interest them most? _____

V. Methods and Materials

A. What teaching methods do you use primarily?

1. Lecture ____
2. Discussion ____
3. Programmed instruction ____
4. Television ____
5. Team teaching ____
6. Audio-visual ____
7. Other _____

B. Do the methods of teaching in this class differ in any way from the methods used with regular English 1A students? Yes_____ No_____

If so, please explain.

If not, do you think it should?

C. What materials do you use? (Please specify authors and titles.)

1. Workbooks ____

2. Handbooks ____

3. Readers ____

4. Programmed texts ____

5. Other _____

D. Do you find these materials satisfactory? Yes_____ Somewhat_____ No_____

If not, what types of materials would you like to see produced?

E. Please describe here any methods and materials that you have found especially effective in helping remedial students.

F. Please specify what methods and materials that you have found to be the least effective.

G. If your department has a syllabus for this course, do you feel it has been helpful? Yes_____ No_____

If so, please specify in what way.

If not, please state why not.

H. Are your grading standards different from grading standards in your regular English classes (1A and 1B)? Yes_____ No_____

If so, please explain.

I. Please describe briefly your method of evaluation of student achievement at the end of the remedial course.

J. Approximately what percentage of your students in this course receive the following grades:

A _____

B _____

C _____

D _____

W _____

F _____

K. How effective do you think this course is?

L. What do you think can be done to improve the teaching of remedial English?

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS ENROLLED IN REMEDIAL ENGLISH

In order to plan an interesting and practical English course for you, we need information about your background, goals, problems, and interests. It would greatly help us if you would answer the following questions:

I. Social and Educational Background and Goals

A. Age_____ Sex_____ Marital Status_____ Citizenship_____

B. Are you a high school graduate? Yes_____ No_____

C. Do you speak a language other than English which you did not learn in school? Yes_____ No_____

If so, what language? _____

D. Are you classified as a foreign student by the registrar? Yes_____ No_____

E. What is (or was) the occupation of your father? _____

F. What is (or was) the occupation of your mother? _____

G. Have you ever worked? Yes_____ No_____

If so, was it full-time___ or part-time___ or both___? In what occupation(s)? _____

H. Are you working now? Yes_____ No_____

If so, how many hours a week? _____

I. Do you feel working at this outside job interferes with your school work, in particular English? Yes_____ No_____

J. Have you decided what occupation or profession you would prefer as a life work? Yes_____ No_____

If so, please name it. _____

K. Do you feel English is essential to achieving success in your chosen occupation or profession? Yes_____ No_____

If so, in what way?

L. Do you plan to transfer to a four-year institution? Yes_____ No_____

M. Do you consider that your high school training in the following areas of English was poor, fair, good, or excellent? (Use P, F, G, or E)

1. Grammar_____

2. Composition_____

3. Speaking_____

4. Reading_____

5. Literature_____

6. Spelling_____

N. With which of the above have you had the most difficulty?

O. In which of the above areas do you feel the most competent?

P. Do you have any personal problems that you believe have contributed to this difficulty? Yes_____ No_____

If you care to specify, please do so.

Q. In general, what do you feel you need to learn most in this course?

R. Do you feel you were properly placed in this class? Yes_____ No_____

II. Reading and Literature

A. Do you enjoy reading? Yes_____ Somewhat_____ No_____

B. Please check the following as to your preference in reading:

	Preferred	Less Preferred	Dislike
1. Novels	_____	_____	_____
2. Short stories	_____	_____	_____
3. Essays	_____	_____	_____
4. Biographies	_____	_____	_____
5. Plays	_____	_____	_____
6. Poetry	_____	_____	_____
7. News	_____	_____	_____
8. Newspaper articles	_____	_____	_____
9. Magazine articles	_____	_____	_____
10. Books or articles on technical subjects	_____	_____	_____
11. Comic books	_____	_____	_____

Newspapers:

C. To which newspaper(s) does your family or you subscribe?

D. What others do you like to read?

E. Please list your favorite sections of the newspaper.

Magazines:

F. What magazines do you read regularly in your home?

G. Can you recall any others you like to read occasionally?

H. Which magazine(s) has the most interesting articles?

I. Which magazine has the most interesting stories?

J. What subjects do you like to read about in magazines?

Books:

K. Do you own books of your own (outside of school textbooks)? Yes_____ No_____

If so, what types of books are they? (Please use list in question B above for guide.)

L. Do you have a public library card? Yes_____ No_____

If so, how many books have you checked out of the library during the past year? _____

M. Have you checked books out of the college library for your own reading interest or pleasure (not for school work) during the past year? Yes_____ No_____

N. Can you remember any unassigned books you have read during the past six months? Yes_____ No_____

If so, please list titles.

O. Can you remember any assigned books you enjoyed reading? Yes_____ No_____

If so, please list titles.

P. Are, or were, your parents interested in reading? Yes_____ No_____

Q. Do you feel that you have any of the following problems in reading?

1. Lack of knowledge of how to use the library facilities (where and how to find the material you want) _____

2. Lack of ability to grasp the meaning of long passages in books or magazines _____

3. Lack of knowledge of vocabulary _____

4. Lack of reading speed _____

5. Others (please list) _____

III. <u>Grammar</u>

A. Do you like the study of grammar? Yes_____ No_____

B. Do you feel that you have any particular problems in this area with which you need help? Yes_____ No_____

If so, please specify.

C. Do you have any problems related to grammar such as the following?

1. Spelling _____
2. Punctuation _____
3. Correct usage _____

D. Which of these ways of teaching grammar have you found helpful to you?

	Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful
1. The use of exercise or workbooks	_____	_____	_____
2. Board demonstrations by the teacher	_____	_____	_____
3. Class discussion	_____	_____	_____
4. Study of handbooks	_____	_____	_____
5. Programmed instruction	_____	_____	_____
6. Writing themes and having them corrected	_____	_____	_____
7. Short quizzes in class	_____	_____	_____
8. Speeches and oral reports	_____	_____	_____
9. Conferences with teacher	_____	_____	_____

E. Do you think the materials used in your class are too difficult____, too easy____, or about right____?

F. Which materials seem most interesting?

Which seem boring?

IV. **Composition**

A. Do you like to write? Yes_____ No_____

Please explain why or why not.

B. What kinds of writing do you expect to do most after you leave college?

1. Business letters_____
2. Business reports_____
3. Speeches_____
4. Personal letters_____
5. Articles for magazines_____
6. Newspaper writing_____
7. Technical or scientific writing_____
8. Short stories_____
9. Novels_____
10. None_____

C. Do you prefer to write in class_____ or outside of class_____? Or do you think both methods should be used? _____

D. Do you like to have help from the teacher while you are writing? Yes_____ No_____

E. Do you think it is helpful to exchange papers with other students and evaluate other students' papers? Yes_____ No_____

F. Do you think that regular conferences with your teacher about your themes would be helpful? Yes_____ No_____

G. Would it give you a better idea of what is expected in papers if mimeographed samples of "A," "B," and "C" papers were passed out at the beginning of the course? Yes_____ No_____

H. Are there some ways that composition has been taught to you that have been especially helpful? If so, please describe briefly.

I. What kind of writing have you found you can do best?

1. Expository (explaining things) _____

2. Narrative (telling a story) _____

3. Descriptive (describing things) _____

4. Persuasive (arguing a point) _____

J. What do you consider your greatest problems or difficulties in writing?